arXiv:hep-th/9211020v1 4 Nov 1992

HAMILTONIAN APPROACH TO 2D SUPERGRAVITY

J. GAMBOA

Division de Physique Théorique,

Institut de Physique Nucleaire [1],

Orsay 91406, France.

C. RAMIREZ

Facultad de Cs. Físico Matemáticas

Universidad Autónoma de Puebla

A.P. 1364, Puebla 72000, México.

Abstract. We study $2D$ supergravity in a covariant and gauge independent way. The theory is obtained from $2D$ bosonic gravity following the square root method and the diffeomorphism superalgebra is explicitly computed. We argue that our approach could be a procedure for introducing nontrivial physics in quantum $2D$ (super)gravity.

IPNO/TH 92/79

CFUAP-92-10

October 1992

[1] *Unité de Recherche des Universités Paris 11 et Paris 6 associée au CNRS.*

Some years ago Polyakov observed that string theory can be understood as $2D$ quantum gravity coupled to d scalar fields [**1**]. When $d = 26$, the scalar fields decouple from gravity and the quantization of strings can be made without understanding the quantization of $2D$ gravity.

The problem of quantizing $2D$ gravity has been considered by Polyakov [**2**], by Knizhnik, Polyakov and Zamolodchikov (KPZ) in the light cone gauge [**3**] and by David, Distler and Kawai (DDK) [**4**] in the conformal gauge.

The results reached by these authors are in complete agreement with numerical simulations [**5**] and with the matrix model approach [**6**]. However, in spite of the relevance that these results have in our understanding of $2D$ quantum gravity, several problems still remain.

One of these problems is the lack of a gauge covariant formulation for quantum $2D$ (super)gravity that would permit us to understand in a gauge independent way the results of KPZ and DDK.

Inspired in Marnelius work [**9**], this problematic has been tackled recently for the bosonic theory [**7-8**] following the traditional metric formalism. However, it turns out that this formalism is too involved to allow a transparent formulation of Hamiltonian formalism, in [**9**] the conformal gauge has been eventually imposed in order to make things easier to handle.

The purpose of this note is, starting from the action of $2D$ gravity given by

$$\mathcal{S} = -\frac{1}{2}\int d^2\sigma(\sqrt{-g}g^{mn}\partial_m\varphi\partial_n\varphi + \frac{Q}{2}R\varphi) \tag{1}$$

to give a manifestly covariant hamiltonian formulation based on the zweibein formalism from which then, by means of the square root method, $2D$ supergravity is obtained. In [1] φ is a scalar field and Q is a numerical coefficient.

Thus, we start considering the zweibein formulation of [**1**]. In the metric formulation the complication arises from the involved form of the scalar curvature in terms of the metric tensor. However, in terms of zweibein formalism, the scalar curvature has a quite a simple form

$$R = \epsilon^{mn}\partial_n\omega_m, \tag{2}$$

where

$$\omega_m = \varepsilon^{kl}\partial_l e^a_k e_{ma}, \tag{3}$$

is the induced Lorentz connexion, e^a_m the zweibein and $\varepsilon^{kl} = e\epsilon_{kl}$ the Levi-Civita invariant density, $e = \det(e^a_m)$ and $\epsilon_{01} = 1$.

In this way the variation of the action gives the equation of motion of the scalar φ:

$$\partial_m(eg^{mn}\partial_n\varphi) = -\frac{Q}{2}eR, \tag{4}$$

and the constraints

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_a &= 2\epsilon^b_a P'_b + \frac{4}{Q}P_\varphi P_a + \frac{4}{Q^2}e_a P^a P_a = 0, \\
\Phi &= \epsilon^{ab}e_a P_b + \frac{Q}{2}\varphi' = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $e^a = e^a_1$, $P_a = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{e}^a_1}$, and $P_\varphi = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\varphi}}$, e^a_0 being Lagrange multipliers.

The hamiltonian is obtained in the usual way and is given by

$$H = \int dx \left[-\frac{1}{2}e^a_0\epsilon^b_a\Phi_b + (e^a_0 P_a)' \right], \tag{6}$$

where the surface term is similar to the four dimensional case and can be discarded with suitable boundary conditions [1].

The constraint algebra closes ad is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\Phi(x), \Phi(x')] = 0, \\
&[\Phi(x), \Phi_a(x')] = \epsilon^b_a \Phi_b(x)\delta(x - x'),
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

and

$$[\Phi_a(x), \Phi_b(x')] = -\frac{8}{Q^2}\epsilon_{ab}\epsilon^{cd}P_c(x)\Phi_d(x)\delta(x - x'). \tag{8}$$

The constraint Φ describes Lorentz transformations with an induced connexion $\frac{Q}{2}P_\varphi$.

The structure of the constraints Φ_a and of their algebra is not very suggestive. Fortunately, after an appropiate canonical transformation on P_a and e_a

$$\begin{aligned}
P_a \to \tilde{P}_a &= \Big(-e^a P_a, \epsilon^{ab}e_a P_b \Big) \\
e_a \to \tilde{e}_a &= \left(\frac{1}{2}ln(e^a e_a), \frac{1}{2}ln(\frac{e_1 - e_0}{e_1 + e_0}) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

[1] For a discussion on the modifications in the non compact case see **[10]**.

and

$$\Phi_a \to \tilde{\Phi}_a = \left(-e^a \Phi_a, \epsilon^{ab} e_a \Phi_b\right), \tag{10}$$

the structure of the constraints, as well as their algebra, simplifies significantly

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Phi}_0 &= -2\tilde{P}_1' + 2\tilde{e}_0' \tilde{P}_1 - 2\tilde{e}_1' \tilde{P}_0 + \frac{4}{Q} P_\varphi \tilde{P}_0 + \frac{4}{Q^2} \tilde{P}^2 \\
\tilde{\Phi}_1 &= -2\tilde{P}_0' + \tilde{e}_0' \tilde{P}_0 - \tilde{e}_1' \tilde{P}_1 + \frac{4}{Q} P_\varphi \tilde{P}_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The algebra is given by the reparametrizations of the circle

$$\begin{aligned}
[\Phi_0(x), \Phi_0(x')] &= (\Phi_1(x) + \Phi_1(x'))\delta'(x - x'), \\
[\Phi_1(x), \Phi_1(x')] &= (\Phi_1(x) + \Phi_1(x'))\delta'(x - x'), \\
[\Phi_0(x), \Phi_1(x')] &= (\Phi_0(x) + \Phi_0(x'))\delta'(x - x'),
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

as well as Lorentz invariance

$$[\Phi(x), \Phi_b(x')] = 0. \tag{13}$$

From (9) it is obvious that the constraints Φ decouple (this similar to the constraint π^0 in gauge theories). In light cone notation the remaining constraints can be written as

$$L_\pm = \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_0 \pm \Phi_1) = \left(h_\pm^2 \pm \frac{Q}{\sqrt{2}} h_\pm' - J_\mp^2 + \frac{Q}{\sqrt{2}} J_\mp'\right), \tag{14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
h_\pm &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{Q} \tilde{P}_0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} P_\varphi + \frac{Q}{\sqrt{2}} (\tilde{e}_1' \mp \tilde{e}_0') \\
J_\pm &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{Q} \tilde{P}_1 \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} P_\varphi \mp \frac{Q}{\sqrt{2}} (\tilde{e}_1' \mp \tilde{e}_0'),
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

satisfy the algebra ($a, b = \pm 1$):

$$\begin{aligned}
[h_a(x), h_b(x')] &= 2a\delta_{ab}\delta'(x - x') \\
[J_a(x), J_b(x')] &= -2a\delta_{ab}\delta'(x - x')
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The last expressions correspond to left and right moving sectors and the constraint algebra (11) is now

$$[L_a(x), L_b(x')] = a\delta_{ab}(L_a(x) + L_a(x'))\delta'(x - x'). \tag{17}$$

In fact, these results reflect the conformal invariance of the theory and are similar to the ones obtained from a gauge covariant treatment of string theory where the constraints are:

$$T_{++} = \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{4g_{11}^2}(g_{00}g_{11} - 2g_{01}^2)(P^2 + X'^2) - \frac{gg_{01}}{g_{11}^2}PX'$$

$$T_{--} = -\frac{\sqrt{-g}g_{01}}{4g_{11}}(P^2 + X'^2) + g\frac{1}{2g_{11}}PX',$$

which are equivalent, of course, to the usual quadratic constraints $P^2 + X'^2$ and PX'.

Having these results in mind, we construct $2D$ supergravity theory following the square root method [**11**]. In the context of four dimensional supergravity theory it was first applied in [**12**].

We start making the following ansatz for the fermionic generators

$$\mathcal{S}_a = \alpha\Gamma_a h_a + \beta Q\Gamma'_a + \gamma\Theta_{-a}J_{-a} + \delta Q\Theta'_{-a}, \tag{18}$$

Awhere α, β, γ and δ are unknown contants and Q is the coefficient that appears in (1); here Γ_a and Θ_a are two dimensional real spinors that obey the Clifford algebra

$$\{\Gamma_a(x), \Gamma_b(x')\} = i\delta_{ab}\delta(x - x'),$$

$$\{\Theta_a(x), \Theta_b(x')\} = -i\delta_{ab}\delta(x - x'). \tag{19}$$

where $\{\ ,\ \}$ denotes symmetric Poisson bracket.

The next step is to impose that the 'square root' of the bosonic theory is the fermionic theory (analogous to the relation between the Klein-Gordon and Dirac equations), i.e.

$$\{\mathcal{S}_a(x), \mathcal{S}_b(x')\} = i\delta_{ab}\tilde{L}_b(x)\delta(x - x'). \tag{20}$$

Using (18) and (19), we find that $\tilde{L}_a$ is

$$\tilde{L_a} = \alpha^2 h_a^2 + \alpha\beta Q h'_a - \alpha^2 i\Gamma_a\Gamma'_a - \gamma^2 J_{-a}^2 - \gamma\delta Q J'_{-a} + \gamma^2 i\Theta_{-a}\Theta'_{-a}. \tag{21}$$

Which is the bosonic constraint modified by the presence of fermions. If we now take the limit $(\Gamma, \Theta) \to 0$, the coefficients α, β, γ and δ can be explicitly computed

$$\alpha = 1 = \gamma, \quad \beta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = \delta. \tag{22}$$

Of course, our task is still incomplete because we have to show that the new set of constraints $(\tilde{L_a}, \mathcal{S}_a)$ satisfy a closed superalgebra.

We find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{\mathcal{S}_a(x), \mathcal{S}_b(x')\} = i\delta_{ab}\tilde{L}_a(x)\delta(x-x'),\\
&[\tilde{L}_a(x), \mathcal{S}_b(x')] = \delta_{ab}(2\mathcal{S}_a(x) + \mathcal{S}_a(x'))\delta'(x-x'),\\
&[\tilde{L}_a(x), \tilde{L}_b(x')] = \delta_{ab}(\tilde{L}_a(x) + \tilde{L}_a(x'))\delta'(x-x'). \qquad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

In consequence all the constraints are first class and the canonical hamiltonian

$$H = \int dx \Big(N^a \tilde{L}_a + i\lambda^a \mathcal{S}_a \Big), \qquad (24)$$

vanishes as a consequence of the reparametrization invariance generated by $\tilde{L_a}$.

The hamiltonian action for this system is

$$\begin{aligned}
S = \int d^2x \Big[&-\tilde{P}_0\dot{\tilde{e}}_0 + \tilde{P}_1\dot{\tilde{e}}_1 - \frac{i}{2}\dot{\Gamma}_a\Gamma_a - \frac{i}{2}\dot{\Theta}_a\Theta_a - N^a\tilde{L}_a - i\lambda^a\mathcal{S}_a \Big]\\
&+ Surface\ Terms. \qquad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

Once the fermionic constraints are determined it is straightforward to compute the local supersymmetry transformations that leave invariant the action (20)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta\tilde{e}_0 = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{Q}(\xi_+\Gamma_+ + \xi_-\Gamma_-),\\
&\delta\tilde{P}_0 = \frac{Q}{\sqrt{2}}\Big[(\xi_+\Gamma_+)' - (\xi_-\Gamma_-)' - (\xi_+\Theta_-)' + (\xi_-\Theta_+)'\Big],\\
&\delta\Gamma_\pm = i\xi_\pm h_\pm - iQ\xi'_\pm,\\
&\delta\tilde{e}_1 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{Q}\Big[\xi_+\Theta_- + \xi_-\Theta_+\Big],\\
&\delta\tilde{P}_1 = \frac{Q}{\sqrt{2}}[(\xi_+\Gamma_+)' + (\xi_+\Theta_-)' + (\xi_-\Gamma_-)' + (\xi_-\Theta_+)'],\\
&\delta\Theta_\pm = -i[\xi_\mp J_\mp - Q\xi'_\mp], \qquad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

plus appropiate transformation rules for the lagrange multipliers N_a and λ_a that are interpreted as the graviton and gravitino respectively.

It is necessary to be cautious with the surface term that appears in (24). The presence of this term implies the invariance under local supersymmetry if and only if at the end points the local supersymmetry parameters satisfy

$$\xi_+(t_1,x)+\xi_-(t_2,x)=0,$$

$$\xi_+(t_1,x)-\xi_-(t_2,x)=0. \tag{27}$$

Now we discuss $2D$ (super)gravity with string-type boundary conditions, i.e., the space direction is compact, of course with suitable boundary conditions so that the boundary terms in (6) vanish. In this case, in analogy to string thery, we can expand the constrints in Fourier Series.

For the bosonic case, with periodic boundary conditions, the constraints are now:

$$\begin{aligned} L_n &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{+\pi} dx e^{inx} L_+(x) = \\ &= \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \alpha_{n-m}\alpha_m - \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \beta_{n-m}\beta_m - \frac{inQ}{2\sqrt{\pi}}(\alpha_n-\beta_n), \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where the time dependent oscillator variables α_n and β_n are defined as

$$\alpha_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\pi}^{+\pi} dx e^{inx} h_+(x),$$

$$\beta_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\pi}^{+\pi} dx e^{inx} J_-(x), \tag{29}$$

and satisfy the equal time Poisson commutators

$$[\alpha_n,\alpha_m] = -2in\delta_{n+m},$$

$$[\beta_n,\beta_m] = 2in\delta_{n+m}. \tag{30}$$

Using (28)-(30), we find that the classical Virasoro algebra is

$$[L_n,L_m] = -i(n-m)L_{n+m}. \tag{31}$$

Canonical quantization is now straightforward, equal-time Poisson brackets are substituted by equal-time commutators. The computation of the central charge is as usual

and it can be easily seen that the contribution of the modes β_n cancel the one of the α_n so, that the resulting central charge is zero. In the supergravity case we have to distinguish between the Ramond and Neveu-Schwarz sectors, thus the constraints for open boundary conditions are

$$L_n = \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \alpha_{n-m}\alpha_m - \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \beta_{n-m}\beta_m - \frac{inQ}{2\sqrt{\pi}}(\alpha_n - \beta_n) + \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} m\gamma_{n-m}\gamma_m - \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} m d_{n-m}d_m, \tag{32}$$

and

$$S_n = \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \gamma_{n-m}\alpha_m - \frac{iQn}{2\sqrt{\pi}}\gamma_n + \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d_{n-m}\beta_m - \frac{iQn}{2\sqrt{\pi}}d_n, \tag{33}$$

for the Ramond sector. Here

$$\gamma_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\pi}^{+\pi} dx e^{inx}\Gamma_+(x)$$
$$d_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\pi}^{+\pi} dx e^{inx}\Theta_-(x), \tag{34}$$

are the fermionic oscillator variables that satisfy the symmetric Poisson algebra

$$\{\gamma_n, \gamma_m\} = i\delta_{n+m}$$
$$\{d_n, d_m\} = i\delta_{n+m}. \tag{35}$$

In the Neveu-Schwarz sector the constraints are

$$L_n = \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \alpha_{n-m}\alpha_m - \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \beta_{n-m}\beta_m - \frac{inQ}{2\sqrt{\pi}}(\alpha_n - \beta_n) + \sum_{r\in Z+\frac{1}{2}} r\gamma_{n-r}\gamma_r - \sum_{r\in Z+\frac{1}{2}} r d_{n-r}d_r. \tag{36}$$

and

$$F_n = \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \gamma_{r-m}\alpha_m - \frac{iQn}{2\sqrt{\pi}}\gamma_r + \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d_{r-m}\beta_m - \frac{iQr}{2\sqrt{\pi}}d_r. \tag{37}$$

In both sectors the Virasoro algebras are (R)

$$[L_n, L_m] = -i(n-m)L_{n+m},$$
$$[L_n, S_m] = -i(n-2m)S_{n+m},$$
$$\{S_n, S_m\} = iL_{n+m}, \tag{38}$$

and (NS)

$$[L_n, L_m] = -i(n-m)L_{n+m},$$
$$[L_n, F_r] = -i(n-2r)F_{n+r},$$
$$\{F_r, F_s\} = iF_{r+s}, \tag{39}$$

Hier the situation after quantization is the same as in the bosonic case, the central charge contributions of all modes cancel to give zero.

Therefore, in conclusion, taking into account the fact that the conformal anomaly does not depend on the gauge fixing, our result means that the theory does not have physical degrees of freedom. In other words, if we fix the conformal gauge the only contribution to the total central charge will be the one of the ghost fields meaning that our theory describes only gauge degrees of freedom. Further, our results depend on the fact that we chose a manifold wiht trivial topology, a stripe or a cylinder. However, if nontrivial boundary conditions are chosen, a nontrivial physical content for the quantum theory can arise as shown by Marnelius **[9]**. In this context, the fact that our formalism is gauge covariant allows a bigger freedom in the choice of nontrivial topologies (boundary conditions). Work is in progress in this direction.

Acknowlegdments. We would like to thank M. Asorey, J.L. Cortés, H.B. Nielsen, S. Ouvry and G. Sierra for the discussions. J.G. thanks A. Macias and H. Salazar at the UAM and UAP (México) for their hospitality. C.R. Thanks J.F. Cariñena at the Departamento de Fisíca Teórica, Zaragoza for his hospitality. J.G. was partially supported by FONDECYT Grant 0867/91 and CNRS. C.R was partially supported by CONACYT-México Grant 0758-E9109.

References

[1] A.M. Polyakov,*Phys. Lett.* **B103**(1981)207.

[2] A.M. Polyakov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A2**(1987)893.

[3] V.H. Knizhnik, A.M. Polyakov and A.B. Zamolodchikov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A3** (1988)819.

[4] F. David, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A3**(1988)1651; J. Distler and T. Kawai, *Nucl. Phys.* **B321**(1989)509.

[**5**] D.V. Boulotov, V.A. Kazakov, I.K. Kostov and A.A. Migdal, *Nucl. Phys.* **275**(1987) 218; F. David, J. Jurkiewicz, A. Krzywicki and B. Petersson,*Nucl. Phys.* **B290**(1987) 218.

[**6**] D.J. Gross and A.A. Migdal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**(1990)717.

[**7**] E.S. Egorian and R.P. Manvelian, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A**(1991)2371.

[**8**] E. Abdalla, M.C.B. Abdalla , J. Gamboa and A. Zadra,*Phys. Lett.* **B273**(1991)222.

[**9**] R. Marnelius,*Nucl. Phys.* **211**(1983)14 and *ibid* **221**(1983)337.

[**10**] T. Regge and C. Teitelboim, *Ann. of Phys. (N.Y.)* **88**(1974)286.

[**11**] P.A.M. Dirac,*Proc. Royal. Soc.* **38**(1928)610.

[**12**] C. Teitelboim,*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**(1977)1106.

[**13**] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim,*Ann. of Phys.* (N.Y)**143** (1982)127 .

[**14**] For a discussion on the surface terms in the spinning string case see, L. Mezincescu and R.I. Nepomechie, *Nucl. Phys.* **B322**(1989)127.